

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 027 829

HE 000 501

By-Wilson, Herbert A.

CCDP: A Timely Venture. A Progress Report on The Cooperative College Development Program.

Phelps-Stokes Fund, New York, N.Y.

Pub Date Dec 68

Note- 11p.

EDRS Price MF-\$0.25 HC-\$0.65

Descriptors-*Community Involvement, *Financial Support, *Higher Education, Institutional Administration, *Management Development

The Cooperative College Development Program (CCDP) began in 1965 to train inexperienced development officers in management development and to help generate activities such as community and alumni annual giving on the campuses of its 23 member institutions. In 1967, CCDP conducted a workshop, with emphasis on the team approach to fund-raising, for its member institutions and a consortium of 15 new institutional members that were sponsored by Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965. The 15-member consortium was represented by university presidents, deans, development officers, trustees, and alumni and public relations officers. Development institutes were conducted in the Spring of 1968 at which participants concentrated on developing plans which they would attempt to implement on their return to campus. Visits to the member institutions in Fall 1968 were made by CCDP staff members, who used checklists to collect data on development personnel, office management, constituency records and research, alumni and community relations, gift processing, and annual alumni and community giving. Nearly all institutions participating in CCDP have personnel who are attempting to organize some form of development program. However the success of these programs will depend on several factors, particularly management effectiveness, the relationship between the institutions and their constituencies, and financial support eventually achieved. (WM)

EDU021027

CCDP: A Timely Venture

**A Progress Report
on
The Cooperative College Development Program**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION**

**THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.**

105 0003H

**By:
Herbert A. Wilson
Vice President
Phelps-Stokes Fund
22 East 54th Street
New York, New York 10022**

December, 1968

A PROGRESS REPORT
On
The Cooperative College Development Program
of
THE PHELPS-STOKES FUND

CCDP -- A Timely Venture

The Cooperative College Development Program was organized to provide basic training for newly recruited, inexperienced development officers and to help generate development activity on the campuses of member institutions.

The scope of CCDP's program of services has been limited mainly to development management, community annual giving, and alumni annual giving. Recently, however, concerns for more rapid progress in development have resulted in the placement of current efforts into the larger context of overall institutional management and governance. The focal points of training sessions and counselling services are based on certain known circumstances or facts:

- member institutions are largely limited to local or state visibility
- their communities and alumni are virtually untapped resources for support
- all of the institutions need additional operating funds
- the development of a good annual fund is the bedrock of recurring, unrestricted funds

Now in its fourth year, CCDP has progressed sufficiently to underscore the importance of this project and suggest that it may be one of the most timely ventures undertaken in recent years by the Phelps-Stokes Fund. A good general indication of progress supports the view just stated: several member institutions have made significant advances in development activity and the general state of readiness at most schools suggests great hope for unprecedented achievement in securing support from private sources. It is also significant to note that when CCDP was established, only Tuskegee Institute had a full-time development officer who functioned in a development capacity, while today, as a result of CCDP efforts, nearly all of the institutions have them.

Financed initially by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, the Program was started on February 1, 1965, with 23 institutions; it was expanded considerably in June, 1967, by the addition of a consortium of 15 institutions, sponsored by Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965. By January 1, 1968, the renewal date of the Sloan Foundation sponsorship for an additional two years, the original group had grown to thirty. CCDP's membership then reached a total of 45 institutions -- 29 private and 16 public.

In December, 1967, following a series of regional workshops for member institutions of the Sloan Foundation challenge program, CCDP concluded this effort by conducting a similar workshop for the fifteen members of its Title III sponsored consortium. The workshop emphasized the team approach to fund-raising. Participants included presidents, academic deans, development officers, alumni and public relations officers, and in one instance, an institutional research officer. Subject matter included: 1) the development concept and the background which led to its emergence;

2) an inspirational challenge to participants who were dubious about development possibilities at their institutions; 3) some "how to do it" sessions for participants who had staff responsibilities for the several development functions at their respective institutions.

Virtually every institution had provided in some way for public relations and alumni affairs, and were organizing these major functions into a team arrangement which included the newly added fund-raising function. Having reached plateaus, a considerable number of institutions were looking for new avenues to broaden the base of constituency support and increase the amount. The establishment of basic development sub-functions seemed to be the biggest challenge in order to effect a change, and it appeared that appropriate budgets and ample time were the big obstacles to getting these important functions into service.

Continual efforts have been made to assess the effectiveness of CCDP and improve the quality of its services. This concern received additional attention following the announcement on October 18, 1967, that the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation would renew its support of the program -- including a second one million dollar challenge grant. While a review of the program at that time yielded positive results, there was some indication that earlier efforts to train development personnel and generate development activity on individual campuses had reached a plateau in relation to possibilities for more substantial gains in fund-raising. Although initial instruction was considered effective, in retrospect, it seems that there were some limitations to bringing together a group of "all stars" recruited individually from highly successful programs. Perhaps, it might have been more rewarding to have enlisted the aid of a developmental "task force" which would have worked together and with the institutions with greater continuity and concentration of energies. The results were gratifying nevertheless, and took new development officers through a stage which they had to pass -- broad perspective and a realization of development possibilities. What remained was the need for individual institutions to implement perspectives that were appropriate to special circumstances of history, tradition, constituencies and their outlook, and to delineate a scope of activity that would be manageable for fledgling programs and personnel.

On February 1, 1968, the Phelps-Stokes Fund contracted with Frantzreb and Pray Associates, Inc., management consultants, to conduct a series of institutes over a two-year period that would: 1) put development in the larger context of management and sponsorship; 2) involve institutional presidents and trustees and/or volunteer leaders; 3) sharpen perspective for development as a management function and as a team approach which transcends management; 4) encourage and facilitate the development of a plan-of-action for each institution, and 5) provide a more systematic basis for staff follow-up visits to the campuses of member institutions. A total of eight institutes were scheduled -- four for development officers, two for presidents, and two for trustees and/or volunteers.

The first development institutes were conducted last Spring at the Moton Conference Center, Capahosic, Virginia. During these institutes, development officers for the first time engaged more in laboratory sessions developing plans for their institutions related to subject matter discussed -- development concept, alumni relations, alumni annual giving, community relations, community support, and development management. Each development officer was expected to take his plan back to the campus, discuss it with his president, revise, approve, and begin to implement it. (In order to bring this report up-to-date, it is necessary to mention that another series of institutes was held just recently during the Fall of 1968. In the Spring of 1969, a second Spring Institute will again include presidents, development officers,

and trustees, reinforcing the work of the earlier institutes. And finally, in the Fall of 1969, the institutes will terminate with an intensive training program for development officers alone.)

In conclusion then, the outline of this report and the accompanying tabular presentations are based largely on subject matter of the Spring Institute and data collected during subsequent fall visits to member institutions. These visits were designed mainly to determine the extent of progress based on plans made at the institutes by development officers for their schools and, hopefully, as approved subsequently by their presidents.

The Survey

A first-hand survey suggests that member institutions of the Cooperative College Development Program have made considerable progress in several development and institutional advancement functions; it also makes it possible to view the results quantitatively and in relative perspective. For example, based on campus visits, of the 37 institutions included in this report, 26 now have full-time development officers and have started the fund-raising function to some degree; those which do not are presently budgeted for the position but have not yet been able to recruit suitable candidates for the job. On the other hand, much remains to be done with several development areas. For instance, the development of systematic procedures for constituency records and research (highly important development management functions) still present the most challenging areas for early implementation. This observation is vividly documented in the tabular presentations which are a part of this report -- especially when viewed in relationship to other items. It may be seen readily, for example, that the "No" responses under "Constituency Records", "Gift Processing", and "Constituency Research", on the average, exceed the "No" responses for all other sections of the report, and are possibly significant in relationship to the high number of "No" responses which have implications for constituency research in the identification and recruitment of volunteer leadership.

A two and one-half page inventory or checklist was the instrument used by CCDP staff members to gather data reported here. In some cases, the answers were not clear-cut, suggesting the need for a more sophisticated instrument. Where it seemed justifiable, a few cases were given the benefit of doubt, especially where implementation momentum was clearly evident. Broad areas covered by the checklist were: development personnel, office management, constituency records, gift processing, constituency research, annual alumni giving, community annual giving, alumni relations, and community relations.

Analysis of some of the individual items -- independently and in relationship to the broad categories -- are suggestive of crucial points and appear to be reasonably significant.

Constituency Records -- The merits of records and especially good records, are perhaps an acknowledged fact and leave little if any basis for debate. Yet comprehensive, systematic record-keeping is virtually non-existent in many institutions and organizations. Survey results show that a substantial number of CCDP institutions face a major problem with records but have a current opportunity to meet this challenge. On the latter point, for example, development officers have been provided with ample

"know how" to implement a system and sets of record forms are being made available by CCDP through support from the Ford Foundation. Institutional commitment, time, and adequate personnel appear to be all that remains in getting this basic job done. Accentuating the urgency of developing a good record system is the fact that it can facilitate greatly the functions of constituency research. Implications for this relationship between constituency records and research are seen in the data regarding the identification and enlistment of volunteers, and have been included for discussion in this section to show similarity of results and suggest how one may affect the other. Specifically, the greatest number of "No" responses, 34, were in the constituency records category, pinpointing the great need for developing biographical file folders. Ranking close in the same category were 29 "No" responses indicating the need for master record cards; and 28 "No" responses accentuate the need for gift history records. Additionally, 28 institutions have no plan for constituency research. All of the above adds to the conclusion that the great need for constituency records is amply documented.

Gift Processing -- Gift processing leaves much to be desired in terms of establishing systematic procedures for recording, acknowledging, and reporting gifts. Certainly, all schools having received gifts, had some way of entering them into their records, acknowledging them, and periodically digging into files to make a report. It was not uncommon to find the function in the president's office or split among several offices. Some of the schools reporting "Yes" answers are moving toward a centralized system which requires time and money. It is noted that answers are rather consistent in all categories except that a slight preponderance of schools lack centralized systems.

Constituency Research -- The minute details and subtleties about a person are often the key factors which enable another person to avoid serious mistakes in relating to that person. Likewise, in development work, good constituency research helps to unearth details and subtleties over and above the conventional personal and typically quantitative data. Constituency research is especially basic to identification and recruitment of volunteers, and is indispensable to their work as they recruit persons to broaden the volunteer base, and in strategy planning for gift solicitation. The more comprehensive the research, the better the chances are for sophisticated strategy.

Data from the schools on constituency research suggest the urgency for substantial improvement in this area; each "Yes" answer could be qualified with such comments as: "being implemented", "partially accomplished", and "planned for implementation within another month". Even so, the proportion of negative responses are significant in relation to the importance of this basic function:

- 28 institutions had no plans for constituency research
- 24 did not have basic research documents
- 22 had not identified and enlisted volunteers from alumni or community
- perhaps resulting from the inadequacy of constituency research, there had been little or no effort to identify and enlist affluent-influential constituencies and involve them appropriately

One of the most revealing points in this latter situation is that the few alumni and community funds in existence are being conducted on staff level -- without the use of volunteers. Furthermore, in the few cases where volunteers were indicated, only a small committee was really involved.

Alumni Annual Giving -- Alumni financial support (amount and participation) is important to the success of fund-raising. These are the people who should care most; their

support helps to build the case to be presented to other constituencies. For the small school or one with not more than local visibility, alumni annual giving becomes even more important. How effective alumni support is depends largely upon the kind of sophistication an institution brings to bear on planning and scheduling an annual alumni fund. Moreover, any plan should include a case tailored for alumni which attempts to relate their own interests to opportunities at the institution.

It was observed in the results of the fall survey that:

- 28 institutions had not developed a case for alumni annual giving
- 20 institutions had not planned and scheduled an annual alumni fund
- a significant number of schools which had planned and scheduled an alumni annual fund, did so however, in a meager fashion to be implemented on the staff level rather than through volunteers

Community Annual Giving -- Community financial support should be considered a good indication of community endorsement notwithstanding sophisticated techniques in fund-raising. It can be safely conjectured that successful community fund-raising is preceded or facilitated by good relations -- relations with the community generally, but especially with affluence-influence in the population. Nevertheless, how ever good these relationships may be, it is up to an institution to plan and schedule a well calculated community annual fund.

It is of considerable interest to note that the second highest number of "No" responses are in the category of "Community Annual Giving". Several specific observations are pertinent:

- In 31 cases, no annual fund had been planned and scheduled; in the 6 cases that had, further checks indicated that 3 had made only meager plans. For the other 3, there had been capital campaigns which apparently were followed-up with good organizational and planning procedures.
- In 30 institutions, no case for community annual giving had been developed or articulated. In most of these instances, however, the president often verbalized orally his view of the institution's case.

Community-Alumni Relations -- A substantial number of schools did isolated things that resulted, often indirectly, in the cultivation of key constituencies. A few had open house, invited alumni and community to Founder's Day ceremonies, or distributed an information piece to a few selected people. Of considerable significance is the fact that few had systematic programs designed to improve community or alumni relations. Of even greater significance is the fact that there was little evidence that any institution had done a thorough study of alumni or community relations to determine programs, purposes, communications and other ways in which to relate to these important groups. Such studies are perhaps more important now than ever in view of campus ferment, challenges to the "old establishment", and demands by students and faculty for a redistribution of governance power. There was, however, some superficial or cursory attention to the alumni situation contained in self-studies of some schools.

Staffing Development Function -- This section of the report does not parallel an inventory category but is based on a question regarding the assignment of staff which appeared under "Gift Processing", "Constituency Research", "Alumni Annual Giving", and

"Community Annual Giving". The general question, "Has a development staff member been assigned to administer this function?", was designed to determine the adequacy of staffing for functions that were in effect, and to see how these were distributed for routine or day-to-day operations. For instance, it is one thing to have a single individual carrying out one or two specific development functions and quite another to claim that one person administers seven or eight functions -- a frequent occurrence in a one-man-shop. There was a special concern for constituency research, gift-processing, and the staff of volunteers because these are functions which require almost single-minded attention, especially for fledgling programs with a substantial backlog of work to be done and with volunteers to identify, enlist, and train. Moreover, there is a wide range of functions and sub-functions in development and advancement work, so many and with such requirements, that it becomes necessary to do only those which one is staffed to do. One alternative to the problem is to secure adequate staff; the other is to pretend to do all of these things at the great risk of dissipating energies over a wide range of activity, accomplishing little or nothing in the final analysis.

Survey results show that a considerable number of institutions did not have several basic functions staffed. In some of the other cases where staffing was indicated, a further check into the situation revealed that the development officer staffed nearly all of the functions, including such basic ones as constituency research and records and gift processing.

Specific results are as follows:

- 26 had no staffing for constituency research
- 24 had no staff to administer gift-processing
- 22 had not assigned staff responsibilities for the community annual fund
- 14 had not assigned staff responsibilities for the alumni fund

Summary Analysis

Nearly all institutions participating in the Cooperative College Development Program have made a good start, especially in being able to begin implementing a relatively new function in higher education and in setting goals for fund-raising. Supporting data indicate the existence of development officers at most schools. There is considerable effort being made to organize the development function for effective coordination; most offices are appropriately located and minimal facilities have been provided. These achievements reflect an attitude of readiness for development work on the part of most institutional executives, and a few successes in fund-raising by several institutions have provided indices of possibilities for others.

The Report, on the other hand, appears to have accentuated the negative, perhaps because there were a considerable number of "No" responses to questions in each category of the inventory. Any unusual attention to negative aspects of the results tabulated was an attempt to focus on the need to implement basic development functions more rapidly -- especially development management and fund-raising -- and on the corresponding opportunities to help achieve development goals.

An unexpected, yet highly significant phrase was prevalent in replies to the inventory questions: instead of clear-cut "Yes" or "No" answers, responses were often "in the process" or "in progress". Persons being interviewed did not like the "No" answers; they appeared to want their program to be much more along the way than was the case. Consequently, when functions were being implemented to any degree, or at least being planned, the answer was always qualified along lines stated above. Nevertheless, these institutions deserve commendation for the amount of progress they have made in such a short time -- from the termination of the Spring Institute in June to the time field visits began in late summer. It is expected that by the time another report is forthcoming, considerably more of the results will be unqualifiedly positive.

Noting earlier, the serious deficiency in community annual giving, under which category appeared the second highest number of "No" responses, (31 schools had not planned or scheduled an annual fund; 30 prepared no case for giving), it seems necessary, at this time, to draw attention to this essential facet of development activity. An institution which has little visibility within its community -- local, county, state, or any other institutionally defined boundary -- is not likely to enjoy the far-reaching benefits of active interest and involvement on the part of significant individuals and groups. Therefore, depending on the size and affluence of the community, its financial support can be very meaningful. As in the case of alumni, community support is exceedingly important -- perhaps even more so, in a relative sense, for some schools:

- In a case where alumni financial potential appears negligible (due to small numbers, limited opportunity for high-income occupations, etc.), community support can become a main source of sustained annual giving;
- Significant community support can be a major factor in almost any case an institution might wish to make or present beyond its community border;
- A case appropriately developed and presented to the community not only establishes visibility but eminent worth -- becoming, ultimately, a major source of community pride.

On the latter point, it should be pointed out that many institutions fail to identify themselves as a community asset; they continue to use the outdated "hat-in-hand" approach. Whatever the community understood about the school, it has, more often than not, taken the institution for granted. Speaking on this point, the President of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, Dr. F. D. Patterson had this to say: "With few exceptions, the colleges have ignored the community and the communities have ignored the colleges."

It cannot be overstated that any case tailored for the community must show how the school is an asset: 1) the economic factor in purchasing power and employment; 2) the cultural resources it proffers; 3) the community services it renders including those which address themselves constructively to community issues and problems. One might add that current social ferment and unrest accentuate possibilities and opportunities without any need to sacrifice institutional integrity. On the basis of the possibilities alluded to above, it can be concluded that the community is perhaps the truly unexplored frontier for the development of institutions in CCDP's membership.

Two or three of the schools have done rather well in fund-raising, and at least two of them have developed considerable sophistication in development management. As a whole, however, there is yet a great challenge to be met and much work to be done. At present, the prime considerations for future progress in the development function at member institutions should be to:

- develop a case for community giving - affecting a confident, positive approach rather than a negative one
- develop as rapidly as possible, effective records and constituency research systems
- identify and enlist volunteers, rather than expect the fund-raising job to be done completely at staff level
- identify and involve the top 10 percent of affluence-influence in development affairs
- provide adequate staffing
- plan and schedule annual funds

As stated from the outset, "...concerns for more rapid progress in development have resulted in the placement of current efforts (training mainly) into the larger context of overall institutional management and governance." The wisdom of this move appears to be amply justified: it is not likely that good development management will exist in an institutional vacuum. Moreover, there is credibility for the notion that a positive correlation exists between and among major management functions (fiscal affairs, academic affairs, student affairs) and institutional development, and only in unusual circumstances are we likely to find a single function that is effective in the absence of overall institutional management strength.

So, while we prepare for institutional development, its ultimate success, in terms of support, will depend upon the effectiveness of the entire management team and how each major officer is able to relate appropriately to important institutional constituencies -- particularly in conveying a comprehensive understanding of his function in relationship to the mission of the institution and, equally important, in demonstrating management effectiveness and efficiency. After all, education is big *business*!

ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT OF THE DEVELOPMENT FUNCTION

		Yes	No
I. Development Personnel			
A.	Has a <u>full-time</u> development officer been <u>assigned</u> and <u>working</u> ?	26	11
B.	Are advancement personnel organized and coordinated to do the job most effectively?	25	12
C.	Has a <u>job description</u> and <u>responsibilities</u> been written for the chief development officer and given <u>official approval</u> ?	19	18
II. Office Management			
A.	Are advancement offices located in close proximity conducive to good internal communication and teamwork?	25	12
B.	Is the chief development officer's office in close proximity to the president's?	24	13
C.	Have the minimum requirements been met for clerical personnel and office equipment?	20	17

PROCEDURES FOR CONSTITUENCY RECORDS AND RESEARCH

III. Constituency Records			
A.	Have the following been implemented for individual and organizational constituents:		
1.	Master information record?	8	29
2.	Gift history record?	9	28
3.	Biographical file folder?	3	34
IV. Gift Processing			
A.	Have the following been implemented for processing gifts and grants:		
1.	Centralized gift receiving system in <u>development office</u> ?	13	24
2.	System for recording gifts?	16	21
3.	System for acknowledging gifts?	17	20
4.	System for reporting gifts?	16	21
B.	Has a development staff member been assigned to administer this function?	13	24
V. Constituency Research			
A.	Are the basic prospect research documents and materials in full-time possession of the development office?	13	24
B.	Does a plan exist for constituency research and is it being implemented?	9	28
C.	Is a development staff member assigned to administer this function?	11	26

ANNUAL GIVING

		Yes	No
VI. Alumni Annual Giving			
A.	Has the alumni annual fund been <u>planned</u> and <u>scheduled</u> ?	17	20
B.	Has the <u>case</u> for alumni annual giving been developed and articulated?	9	28
C.	Has <u>volunteer leadership</u> been identified and enlisted?	15	22
D.	Have staff <u>responsibilities</u> been assigned for the alumni fund?	23	14
VII. Community Annual Giving			
A.	Has the annual fund in the community (local friends, organizations, business and industry) been <u>planned</u> and <u>scheduled</u> ?	6	31
B.	Has the <u>case</u> for community annual giving been developed and articulated?	7	30
C.	Have members of the <u>community power structure</u> been identified and enlisted?	15	22
D.	Have <u>staff responsibilities</u> been assigned?	15	22

CONSTITUENCY RELATIONS

VIII. Alumni Relations			
A.	Has alumni research identified and involved the <u>top 10%</u> according to influence-affluence or leadership-giving potential?	10	27
B.	Is there an effort to study alumni-college relations, including the future of the alumni association, defining purpose, program organization, events and communications?	17	20
IX. Community Relations			
A.	Has the community research identified and involved the <u>top level</u> of influence-affluence or leadership-giving potential?	13	24
B.	Has a program been developed for community-college relations, defining purpose, organization events, and communications?	8	29